

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank Examiner Lesperance for the courtesies extended during the in-person interview of June 6, 2006 wherein the Examiner agreed to reconsider.

Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 4-6, 20-22, 24-26, 35-37, 44 and 46-49 have been allowed. Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 10, 11, 16, 17, 41 and 42 would be allowable if the claims are written in independent form.

Remaining claims 8, 12-15, 18, 29 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenda in view of Kotha et al and further in view of Le as to claims 8 and 13. Applicant respectfully submits that it appears that claim language has been overlooked and also respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter is not taught or suggested by the cited references. For example, claim 8 requires, among other things, that in addition to receiving the capability parameters regarding a first display of multiple displays and substituting selected display capabilities of a second display for the received capability parameters of the first display, that the memory further comprises "operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities of a second display based on a composite of the display parameters for each of the multiple displays to allow displaying of at least a portion of the drawing surface on both of the multiple displays." However, it does not appear that this claim language has been addressed in the office action and none of the cited references have been cited as allegedly teaching this subject matter. Also, the office action states that "Zenda teaches all of the claim limitations as recited in claims 4, 5 and 20 with the exception of providing the capability parameters comprise display resolution and display pixel depth." (See

office action, page 3). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter has not been addressed and is not taught in the cited references, accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

For argument sake, even if the office action had alleged that Zenda taught the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that Zenda does not allow displaying of a portion of the drawing surfaces on both of the multiple displays. Zenda is not directed to a multiple display system that displays portions of a common drawing surface on a plurality of multiple displays and as such, does not, among other things, allow displaying of at least a portion of the drawing surface on both of the multiple displays. In fact, Zenda is specifically directed to a single plasma display apparatus as it is directed to a system that actually modifies the display area of a single display apparatus depending upon display resolution changes. In particular, as stated in the Zenda reference, it provides a display area control system wherein when display is made in a plurality of display modes of different display resolutions “in a single plasma display apparatus” a display position on a display screen can be optimized. (Column 1, lines 45-46). Accordingly, since Zenda fails to teach the claimed subject matter, the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and are also believed to be allowable as at least depending upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 39 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenda in view of Le. Claim 39 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 43. As to claim 39, the office action alleges that the Zenda reference teaches all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of “providing substituting selected display capabilities for the received capability parameters.” (See office action, page 8). However, the claim requires, among other

things, determining selected display capability parameters based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple displays. However, as noted above, Zenda is not directed to a multiple display system and as such, cannot teach the subject matter as alleged. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance. In addition, the claim also requires that the method include receiving the display capability parameters in response to a monitor change process. The office action however alleges that Zenda teaches this subject matter in column 3, lines 11 and 12. However, this portion refers to a change in a same display screen and not changing of monitors as claimed. As such, Zenda does not teach what is alleged in the office action nor does it teach the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance at least for this reason as well. Other distinctions will be recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/26/06

By: Christopher J. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005